

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2006.

The Information Disclosure Statements filed on November 27 and November 29, 2006, were not considered by the Examiner for they were filed after the examination of the first office action and before the mailing of the Final Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that the prior art in these Information Disclosure Statements be considered.

Claims 11-22 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-22. The present Response amends claims 13-14, 17-18, and 21-22, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 11-22. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 13-14, 17-18, and 21-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims contain incorrect spelling of Query and appropriate correction is required. Claims 13-14, 17-18, and 21-22 have been amended as suggested.

Claims 1, 12, 15-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0196168, filed April 10, 2002).

Claims 13-14, 17-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0196168, filed April 10, 2002) in view of Sutherland (U.S. Patent No. 7,054,858, filed August 1, 2001).

Independent claims 11, 15, and 19 read as follows:

11. A computer-implemented method comprising:
converting first XML data into second XML data having a different shape; and
converting the second XML data to JAVA data.
15. A computer-based system adapted to do the steps of:
converting first XML data into second XML data having a different shape; and
converting the second XML data to JAVA data representation.

19. A computer-readable medium comprising code to:
convert first XML data into a second XML data having a different shape; and
convert the second XML data to JAVA data.

None of the prior art discloses, suggests, or gives a motivation for, alone or in combination, “converting first XML data into second XML data having a different shape.” For example, Hu describes converting between UML and XML, but UML is not XML. For this reason, claims 11, 15, and 19 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 are dependent upon these independent claims and for that reason (and because of the additional limitation of these claims), these claims are believed to be allowable.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 26, 2007

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No.: 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800